

CAMERON JEFFERSON; *Consumer*
ESTATE OF CAMERON JEFFERSON; *Consumer*
11509 Brigit Court [20720]
Bowie Maryland, USA
cameronjefferson@mail.com

FILED _____ ENTERED _____
LOGGED _____ RECEIVED _____
MAR 09 2017
AT GREENBELT
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MARYLAND
DEPUTY
BY _____

**DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF MARYLAND**

**CAMERON JEFFERSON; *Consumer*;
ESTATE OF CAMERON JEFFERSON;
Consumer, Foreign State
vs.
BWW LAW GROUP LLC;
SELECT PORTFOLIO SERVICES;
*Respondent(s) Debtors***

DCUS Case No: TDC-17-0243

**MANDATORY JUDICIAL
NOTICE**

Pursuant to Federal Rule Civil Procedure §44.1, the Plaintiff files the Judicial Notice and Writ. On January 26, 2017, this Enforcement Action was filed in this District Court of the United States for the Judicial District of Maryland. ("DCUS") 28 USC§100(2). As opposed to a United States District Court, ("USDC") which is a legislative tribunal under Article I, Section §8, Clause §17. A federal Judicial Court, pursuant to Article III, I, II, and III, acting in constitutional mode is required to hear any controversy between two states, federal question, copyright, patent and infringement, International Law and controversies to which the United States is a party. see, 28 USC§1251, §1331, §1454, §1338 and Chapter §41, Title 15 USC§1692, Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, which is Public International Law §111-203, common law.¹

The Supreme Court has original and exclusive jurisdiction over the above actions. 28 USC§1251. In addition, a District Court of the United States, ("DCUS")

¹ A foreign state is a political subdivision and deemed to be an independent State government.

which is an Article III, Court such as the Court of International Trade, is such a court.
28 USC§610

Since this action requires a properly commissioned Article III, Judge and not an Article I, Administrative agency such as a USDC, the enforcement action requires a transfer pursuant to 28 USC§1404, amongst others, or one of the options defined in 28 USC§292, 293, 295, 296 or 297, respectively. This is not a Civil action governed under Article I, as the Plaintiff is properly clothed with Judicial standing pursuant to Article III, of the US Constitution, treaties and laws of the United States. The Plaintiff is a foreign state, as defined in 28 USC§1603, Foreign Sovereign Immunity Act, (“FSIA”) and all immunities, protections and sovereignty described in §1604-§1611.

The Plaintiff is a *consumer, creditor, secured party, principal, Lender*, defined at §1692a (3)(4) and §1692a (6)(iv). 31 USC§5312 also defines the Plaintiff as a *private banker, issuer, financial institution and financial agency* collectively. Lastly the Truth in Lending Act, 12 USC§1026.36, properly defines a consumer as the “Individual Loan Originator”. This action involves *foreign Trade* and for the Respondents, Defendants, interstate commerce. The Plaintiff is not subject to interstate commerce laws. Plaintiff traded certain goods, and private currency, such as Notes and Securities which are not Federal Reserve currency.²

Furthermore, such Sovereign Immunity is codified in the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 USC§1692(c), amongst others. As well, the Supremacy Clause, Article VI, applies to the Enforcement Action, which is also *codified* in the §1692(n), FDCPA.

i.² An “individual loan originator” is a natural person who meets the definition of “loan originator” in paragraph (a)(1)(i) of this section.

To eliminate any confusion, the Plaintiff is not a US Citizen, citizen of the United States, (14th Amendment) resident, or resident alien of the State of Maryland. The Plaintiff is in fact a non-resident alien of the State of Maryland, and American National, not citizen subject to the municipal District of Columbia. Maryland, a Union State, as opposed to the State of Maryland, is not within the United States District Courts jurisdiction.

ECKERT SEAMANS CHERIN & MELLOTT LLC

Recently, the Plaintiff received a communication defined in 15 USC§1692 a(2), Eckert is a *debt collector*, §1692a (5) involved in the collection of an allege *debt*, §1692a (6). Eckert was not granted consent from the Consumer, foreign state, to communicate, or contact the consumer in any manner. Eckert suffers from the illusion that it, a limited liability company, and debt collector, represents another debt collector, BWW and SPS. Consequently, this illegal behavior and conduct appears to be a continuing scheme by unknown concealed debtors, hiding behind limited liability companies, who are unregistered corporations. LLC's are in fact Resident Aliens. The Resident Alien Proviso has been repealed, thus resident aliens are no longer deemed residents of any state and diversity does not exist.

Eckert, SPS and BWW's citizenship is unknown, and upon information and belief, such citizenship does not exist and has not properly been revealed. This violates §1692j, FDCPA. Eckert has earned its place as a Defendant in this action, as well its previous illegal and unlawful intrusion is the last case less than a year ago. In this regard, Eckert Seaman will as well be prosecuted along with BWW and SPS and the proper amendment to reflect Eckert's defendant status is forthcoming.

Secondly, Eckert lacks any standing and capacity to impersonate an attorney for the Defendants, and by "false representing or implication that any individual is an attorney or that any communication is from an attorney". §1692e (3) This portion of the FDCPA, codifies crimes under Title 18 USC, such as perjury, false claims, fraud,

Aggravated Identity Theft to name a few. Eckert also impersonates being vouched for, bonded by, affiliated with the United States by Trespass on the Case, §1692e (1) which is also a crime under 18 USC§912.

Eckert has engaged in these criminal acts previously in another action brought by the Plaintiff, which involved Eckert, this Tribunal and an Article I, administrator, referred to as a Judge, who erroneously dismissed a similar action unlawfully and illegally. The Plaintiff, this time, will take decisive action against any person, who obstructs, interferes, or attempts to thwart, prohibit this constitutional enforcement action. Plaintiff is painfully aware of the business connections and relationships with residents who transacts business in this district and the propensity of administrative officers to protect its profit generators, like Eckert.

Unfortunately, Eckert, or any other person, who attempts such intimidation, will be charged with each offense codified within the FDCPA, such as 18 USC§1512. Several other criminal offenses and several others such as Conversion, Embezzlement, Malicious Prosecution, Abuse of Process, Harassment and the use of profane and obscene language. (legalese) §1692(d)(f)(e). Plaintiff will also warn of charges for Racketeering Influence Corruptions Organizations (RICO), which is a perfect fit for all defendants involved.

Accordingly, the Plaintiff, State and Consumer, who is prosecuting this action, will be given the proper respect, courtesy, and compliance with its Judicial authority and power established by Article III, Section I, II and III. As well, the judicial and political power defined in the Bill of Rights, Ten Commandments, elevated above Article III of the US Constitution.³

Eckert's illegal and unlawful attempt to avail itself of civil rule play and other deflection legal flares is notwithstanding and rendered moot by the Plaintiff,

³ The offence criminally of Mail and Wire Fraud, 18 USC§1341 and §1343 is properly codified in the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 USC§1692, *et al*.

consumer who has superiority, subject matter and personal jurisdiction over each defendant.

Eckert's baseless pre-motion request is *denied* by Plaintiff, as well its request for a Telephonic Conference March 10, 2017. This action pending is in the *Jefferson* Court pursuant to Article III, and not subject to civil rules, as the current Judge Chuang clearly stated in its Case Management Order. Judge Chuang comprehends the waiver, limitation of civil rules when it comes to this Article III, type of action. *see*, 28 USC§2072 and §2075. These judicial procedures coincide with §1692(d)(1)(2)(3) and the common law, other laws of the United States of America.

Eckert's will not be allowed in manner to disregard the law it is "*subject to*", neither will it continue to overthrow Plaintiff, whom in this case is its superior and an independent judicial court, judge. This fact is clearly recognized by the Congress and thus the Congress has entered Judgment of this very fact upon enacting the FDCPA in 1977. Eckert must be granted consent to communicate in any manner with respects to this case, directly from the Plaintiff, consumer, as mandated by §1692c, FDCPA, which in International Law. Further, until this action is before a proper Article III, Judge assigned by certificate to advance this constitutional action, permission can only be granted from a court of competent jurisdiction, if necessary.

Eckert's reference to a previous case brought in the United States District Court which lacks judicial power and authority, as such any result, adjudication, was merely an opinion and memorandum, informal in nature and thus non-judicial. Eckert is also warned that it may invoke its right to remain silent, as any communication to Plaintiff, both previously and presently is deemed sworn to, under oath. Since any communication under the FDCPA, International Law and the US Constitution, with a consumer, foreign State is construed as verified and validated. *see*, Fed.Rule §11(a), which requires a response under oath, by sworn affidavit, and Rule §8 respectively.

Regardless of whether Eckert, others follow the law, or even the its own rules, which is obvious thinks it is bound by no laws or rules. Eckert and others will strictly comply with every duty and obligation, or significant consequences will result. Eckert's, BWW and SPS, clearly has enough problems in their previous communications and ability to comply with the law, including its use of a foreign mathematical instrument in its payoff statements.

While the civil rules are forgiving of willful and intentional mistakes and misconduct, the law brought in this Courtroom, by the consumer, who is the Court and Judge, as supported by the FDCPA, US Constitution, is not, will not be so forgiving. The time of debtors, especially attorneys who are specifically barred, restrained by Congress from crossing into foreign countries and nations, of foreign states. Has come to an end, so is the crime of obtaining, or attempting to seize, confiscate Land, property, assets, currency, consumer accounts, identities and other private property. Prosecutions by the State, (foreign) consumers will increased substantially, as it is clear the territorial States, of the District of Columbia, will not do so.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, the Clerk of Court should strike the motions by Eckert's regarding the requested Telephonic Conference March 10, 2017, as well any Notice of Appearance purporting to afford defendants, respondents to separate themselves from its capacity such, by acting as counsel, or its own counsel, is notwithstanding. Plaintiff, has already found BWW, SPS, guilty, liable pursuant to §1692k(a), FDCPA, and such Judgment is judicial in nature. BWW, SPS and now Eckert is free to file an enforcement action pursuant to §1692i, if it opposes the Plaintiff, consumers Judgment. Of course, such filing of this action in compliance with International Law, is highly unlikely, since Eckert's, BWW and SPS knows it lacks standing to do so. See, Civil Rule §57.

The Plaintiff, requests to Clerk protect the integrity of this Judicial action and prevent trespass on the case, unless proper consent and permission is granted to any defendant(s), respondent(s).

The Plaintiff has and will not waive any sovereign immunity, power and authority supported by laws of the United States. Plaintiff maintains concurrent jurisdiction with even the Article III, Court and duly commissioned Judge. Eckerts, BWW and SPS, at this point are witnesses and followers, while Plaintiff is the suite along with his retinue. The common law controls this case.

If a situation exists, whereby this controversy is not assigned a proper Article III, judge and court, Plaintiff will either file application for Transfer, Removal to the Court of International Trade, 28 USC§1581, or dismiss the action to refile in the Court of International Trade who has original and exclusive jurisdiction over the action.

Defendants, including Eckert's, should do its best to arrange payment of the Judgment rendered by Plaintiff for its liability to the Consumer for its illegal acts. Additional acts in violation of law, will only add to those actual damages, per violation committed.

Eckert's, BWW and SPS will remain under Plaintiff's authority and power, subject to the FDCPA, common law and Constitutional protections until notified otherwise. Strick compliance with the FDCPA, is not an option, is not waivable by reliance of any rule which conflicts with the prosecution of this action. It would make sense for Eckert, others to at least comply with Judge Chuang's Case Management Order, prior to attempting to circumvent not only its superiors Orders, but importantly, Plaintiff's Judicial Orders.

Lastly, Eckert's, BWW and SPS strict compliance with Plaintiff's Cease and Desist Order, which is Injunctive Relief, Restraining Order power granted a consumer, foreign State.

This recognized judicial power and authority is on par with Civil Rule §65. Eckert, BWW and SPS would be smart to pay attention to §1692c(3)(c) and its required notices and restricted responses pursuant to (1)(2) and (3). As well Eckert's off base arguments and procedural rule play, without merit, is evidence of its violation of §1692c(3)(b), amongst others.

This notion amongst lawfully admitted aliens which are debtors and debt collectors, legally sanctioning criminal seizure and theft of independent sovereign foreign State, governments, assets, identity, Land, property and private currency, again, has seen its last days. International Terrorism as defined in 18 USC§2331, is also codified in the FDCA, other laws, and is easily prosecutable by the State, consumer criminally. Eckert, BWW and SPS and its bogus, false claims of being a Trustee was long so terminated, rescinded and impeached, to the point it ever existed. Neither Eckert, BWW, nor SPS, are, ever had been creditors of the consumer. A legitimate creditor is only an employee and servicer to the Consumer, created and hired by the consumer to perform acts and duties to the benefit of the its superior and Lender, the consumer.

The Truth in Lending Act, 12 USC§1026.36, will clearly discount any false claim that an assignee, other than the hired creditor named on the foreign instrumentality of the Consumer who is the maker, manufacturer of those goods and product, is a creditor. Furthermore, the FTC Holder Rule, 16 CFR§433.2, destroys the international (paper) terrorism crimes BWW, Eckert and SPS, others engage in religiously. As another warning to the RICO clan, 18 USC§1365, fits perfectly. Counterfeiting and Forgery is a criminal offence under 18 USC§25, other laws.⁴

⁴ Accordingly, both debt collectors and Creditors are governed, controlled, and *subject to* the consumer's judicial and political sovereign power and authority defined in the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 USC§ 1692. A creditor is described at §1692a(4), while a debt collector at §1692a(6). Both debt collector and creditor are subject to the entire act.

Defendants, Respondents will learn this time, that a consumer's which is a foreign state, private banker, financial institution, banker and its private script, currency, ie, Notes, Mortgages, consumer accounts and other foreign instrumentalities, are not third party federal reserve currency and notes.⁵

A consumer's currency, instrumentality, is its own goods and product, manufactured, issued, patented and copyrighted under laws of the United States of America, international laws and others. They are in fact Obligations of the United States, 18 USC§8, §471, as well, others.

The years of crimes and other offenses of debtors alleging a consumer, owes principal and debt to a debtor, even a legitimate creditor, who is subordinate to its Master, the consumer. Has been crimes allowed conceal itself behind legal musical chairs, and the mistake to allow Article I, administrative tribunals to adjudicate the unlawful and illegal acts of its residents, who transact business and trade, beneficial and profitable to its district, all others involved, will be the result this time. This action will be prosecuted under an inferior, delusional Banana Republic, but a proper duly constitutional one.

The Alien Tort Act, 28 USC§1350, will also be prosecuted by Plaintiff, in the Jefferson court, once the action is amended and docketed by week's end. The ATS applies to the illegal and unlawful acts of defendants during the last year and presently. Eckert, BWW, SPS and any other party should also consider the entirety

⁵ Defendants should also take judicial notice of §1692e(1) regarding false representation (False Claims) of any badge, uniform and facsimile of the United States. This portion of international law, deals specifically with counterfeiting Obligations of the United States, with facsimile meaning copies of Notes, scripts, other instrumentalities, even of a foreign state, nation and country where Plaintiff is situated. Defendants has long relied up facsimiles of private currency, securities, notes, accounts, which are obligations of the United States.

of Chapter §41, Title §15, especially, Antitrust, Sherman and Clayton Acts respectively.

Each of the defendants are *persons*, defined in 15 USC§7, subject to both acts and enforcement of those laws by the consumer.

JUDICIAL ORDER TO FURNISH BOND

The Federal Rules §65(c) and §65.1, which requires the Defendants, Respondents file a Surety Bond with the Jefferson Court, Clerk to cover all liabilities, actual damages and costs sustained by the Court, in this case Plaintiff, Cameron Jefferson and his Estate. Confronting one of the significant issues of debtors, like Eckert, BWW, SPS and others, is the fact the limited liability companies are entirely inappropriately under insured, bonded and indemnified to be engaging in what is obvious, a criminal and civil racketeering scam, dealing with Land Theft, Embezzlement, Counterfeiting, Tax Evasion, Bank, Wire and Mail Fraud, amongst other crimes and torts.

A limited liability company, which is not a corporation, or citizen, are no more than criminal getaway cars with no registration, tags, or insurance, and thus used as a conduit and pass through company of illegal profits, gains, property, including Land. Unfortunately, an immigrant, foreign company granted a privilege to perform in the according to the laws of the United States of America, has no constitutional protections in a federal court.

Ironically, a limited liability company structure to limit its liability of its debts is just as big of a scam upon America, in addition to the other crimes defendants are engaged in religiously. How can a debt collector have limited liability when first, attorneys are completely barred from engaging in debt collection activities by Congress, as an attorney? §1692e (3) This also goes to the issue of Eckert, BWW, SPS, impersonating being bonded, vouched for, affiliated with the United States,

§1692e(1), since the United States is the only entity who can advance such *federal* debt collection actions without a Bond. 28 USC§3002.

To prevent escape of any sort of its debts due to the Consumer, even the principal amounts which would have been due if such action was legitimate. The ability to tender payment and be properly bonded and insured is a mandatory requirement of any person, association, firm, corporation engaged in interstate and foreign commerce, trade, within the United States, as well intrastate. (foreign commerce)

Eckert, BWB and SPS, who are all limited liability companies has failed to demonstrate proper insurance and bonding, thus it can litigate, procrastinate, deflect and play civil rule ping pong for years, with no monetary consequence, or security being put up for its illegal acts, which are evident and unavoidable. The only true limited liability entity in the United States of America, United States, is a consumer, foreign state, in its sovereign capacity. Consumers are the natural resource of all wealth of a country, not debtors who live off of consumers, *consumer credit* (not loans) like Eckert, BWB and SPS.

For these reasons and others, a Bond is Ordered to file a Surety Bond with this judicial Court no later than March 13, 2017, in the amount of the Judgment contained within the Plaintiffs Enforcement Action. A failure to do so, will bar any further participation in this action, although limited anyway. But in addition, sanctions consistent with §1692k(a) may very well be in order if defendants fail prove proper bonding and insurance to the Plaintiff. The Bond shall be made out in the name of Plaintiff and his estate.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated this March 8th Day, 2017 in Maryland State, USA.

By: 

Cameron Jefferson, *Consumer*
Foreign State, *Consul*
Estate of Cameron Jefferson

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that a copy of the foregoing was served by US First Class Mail to the following;

CARRIE M. WARD, Debtors and Respondents
BWW LAW GROUP LLC
6003 Executive Blvd. Suite 101
Rockville, MD 20852 US

ECKERT, SEAMANS CHERIN & MELLOTT LLC
1717 Pennsylvania Avenue N.W. 12th Floor
Washington, DC 20006

cc: file
cc: Court of International Trade
cc: Federal Trade Commission
cc: Consumer Financial Protection Bureau
cc: Department of Homeland Security